

<p align="center">IPAT Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments (December 2009)</p>	<p align="center">As found in BHC Consultants Recommended Comprehensive Plan Amendments (October 2010)</p>
<p>Economic Development Element</p> <p>p. 3-2 5.0 <i>The development of industries should be encouraged within the cities, urban growth areas, designated Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRDs), and within those unincorporated areas of Lewis County which satisfy the requirements set forth in RCW 36.70A.<u>350</u>, 365, and .367, <u>and</u> .368.</i></p>	<p>Economic Development Element</p> <p>BHC Recommendation includes IPAT proposed changes at page 3-2.</p>
<p>Economic Development Element</p> <p>pp. 3-8 – 3-10 New <u>Policy 1.x</u> <u>The County will implement Growth Management Act provisions that facilitate industrial development of former surface coal mining land as provided in RCW 36.70A.368.</u></p>	<p>Economic Development Element</p> <p>BHC Recommendation includes IPAT proposed changes at Policy 3.12, page 3-15.</p>
<p>Land Use Element</p> <p>p. 4-5 Major Industrial Developments ... <u>In addition, to industrial development pursuant to RCW 36.70A.365 and RCW 36.70A.365 <i>[error in IPAT application – should be “367”]</i>, Lewis County may designate a master planned location for major industrial activity subject to the provisions of RCW 36.70A.368.</u></p>	<p>Land Use Element, Urban Growth Area Sub-Element</p> <p>BHC Recommendation includes IPAT proposed changes <i>[with correction]</i> at page 3.</p>

<p align="center">IPAT Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments (December 2009)</p>	<p align="center"><i>As found in BHC Consultants Recommended Comprehensive Plan Amendments (October 2010)</i></p>
<p>Land Use Element</p> <p>Policy LU 2.4 Urban growth should occur within urban growth areas only and not be permitted outside of an adopted urban growth area except for new fully contained communities; master planned resorts, industrial reserve areas (IRAs), <u>major industrial developments</u>, crossroads communities and rural town centers.</p>	<p align="center">Amendment unnecessary with BHC Recommendation.</p>
<p>Land Use Element</p> <p><u>New policy LU 7.x</u> <u>A Major Industrial Development – Master Planned Location designated pursuant to RCW 36.70A.368 must satisfy the following criteria:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Must be located on lands formerly used or designated for surface coal mining and supporting uses; that consist of an aggregation of land of one thousand or more acres, which is not required to be contiguous; and that are suitable for manufacturing, industrial, or commercial businesses;</u> <u>(b) New infrastructure is provided for; and</u> <u>(c) Environmental review of a proposed designation of a master planned location must be at the programmatic level, as long as the environmental review of a proposed designation that is being reviewed concurrent with a proposed major industrial activity is at the project level.</u></p>	<p>Land Use Element, Urban Growth Area Sub-Element</p> <p align="center">BHC Recommendation includes IPAT proposed changes at Policy LU 9.4, page 10.</p>

IPAT Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments (December 2009)	<i>As found in BHC Consultants Recommended Comprehensive Plan Amendments (October 2010)</i>
<p>Land Use Element</p> <p>Policy LU 8.3 Allow for the designation of Major Industrial Developments/Major Industrial Developments – Master Planned Locations at certain specified locations outside of designated Urban Growth Areas pursuant with RCW 36.70A.365, <u>and</u> RCW 36.70A.367, <u>and</u> RCW 36.70A.368.</p>	<p>Land Use Element, Urban Growth Area Sub-Element</p> <p>BHC Recommendation includes IPAT proposed changes at Policy LU 9.3, page 10.</p>
<p>Land Use Element</p> <p>p. 4-31</p> <p>6. New large-scale activities in the rural areas shall be reviewed through provisions for fully contained communities, major industrial projects, master planned resorts, and industrial land banks, including the identification of both criteria and potential locations for such uses. RCW 36.70A.360, 362, 365, 367, <u>368.</u></p>	<p>Amendment unnecessary with BHC Recommendation.</p>
<p>Capital Facilities/Utilities Element</p> <p>p. 4-13 (should be 13-4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developments authorized under RCW 36.70A.350, 360, 362, 365, <u>and</u> 367, <u>and</u> 368 may be served by urban sewer and water systems consistent with state law. However, no additional connections may be allowed at urban levels of service in the land between adopted UGAs. (CPP 2.6) 	<p>Capital Facilities and Utilities Element</p> <p>BHC Recommendation includes IPAT proposed changes at page 4-14.</p>